



## ***Environmental Planning Commission***

***Agenda Number: 2  
Project Number: 1000310  
Case Numbers: 09EPC-40020/40021  
September 10, 2009***

### ***Supplemental Staff Report***

<b><i>Agent</i></b>	FBT Architects
<b><i>Applicant</i></b>	North I-25 Corporate Center LLC
<b><i>Requests</i></b>	<b>Site Development Plan for Subdivision</b>  <b>Site Development Plan for Building Permit</b>
<b><i>Legal Description</i></b>	Signetics Albuquerque Facility, Tract A, Unit B, North Albuquerque Acres
<b><i>Location</i></b>	Between San Mateo Blvd. and I-25, and between San Diego Ave. and Modesto Ave.
<b><i>Size</i></b>	Approximately 60 acres
<b><i>Existing Zoning</i></b>	SU-2 for M-1
<b><i>Proposed Zoning</i></b>	No Change

#### ***Staff Recommendation***

***APPROVAL of 09EPC 40021, based on the  
findings beginning on Page 19 and the  
Conditions of Approval beginning on Page 22.***

***APPROVAL of 09EPC 40020, based on the  
findings beginning on Page 31 and the  
Conditions of Approval beginning on Page 34.***

***Staff Planner  
Catalina Lehner-AICP, Senior Planner***

#### ***Summary of Analysis***

This proposal is for a site development plan for subdivision, with design standards, and a site development plan for building permit for a first phase of development. The applicant proposes commercial and office uses on the approx. 60-acre site of a former manufacturing plant. This proposal has been deferred three times to allow for improvement of the proposed design standards.

The subject site is in the Developing Urban area. The North Valley Area Plan, the Facility Plan for Arroyos and the North I-25 Sector Development Plan apply. Staff finds that the proposal furthers and partially furthers applicable goals and policies.

A facilitated meeting was held. Neighbors expressed concern, mostly about traffic issues. There is general support. No new correspondence has been received.

Staff recommends approval of both requests, subject to the many conditions needed to create completeness and compliance. Delegation of approval authority to the DRB, for future development, is not recommended at this time.

This report should be read in conjunction with the June 2009 original Staff report and the July 2009 first supplemental Staff report (see attachments).

This proposal first entered the Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) process in May 2009. Prior to the June hearing, the applicant requested a 30-day deferral. At the July hearing, the applicant accepted Staff's recommendation for a 30-day deferral. Both deferrals were intended to allow additional time to improve the submittal, particularly the design standards.

For the July hearing, the applicant made some revisions and re-organized the proposed design standards. Extensive feedback was available in the June 2009 Staff report (see attachment) and as a preliminary review conducted by Staff. However, many suggestions were not incorporated. For example, the site development plan for building permit was not revised to comply with the design standards.

For these reasons and others, the July hearing lasted several hours. The EPC provided additional suggestions, which were added to the list of conditions provided by Staff. The proposal was deferred for approx. 60 days to a special hearing on September 10, 2009 to allow time to incorporate the many suggested revisions.

The revised version of the proposed site development plan for subdivision and site development plan for building permit (dated August 20, 2009) are the subject of this second supplemental Staff report.

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

### ***REQUEST (repeated in brief)***

This two-part proposal is for a site development plan for subdivision with design standards (09EPC 40021) and a site development plan for building permit (09EPC 40020) for a first phase of development. The applicant proposes office and commercial uses, including a bank, hotel and restaurant, to be known as the North I-25 Corporate Center.

The approximately 60 acre site, zoned SU-2 for M-1, is located between San Mateo Blvd. and Interstate-25, and between San Diego Ave. and Modesto Ave., approx. 0.35 miles northeast of the North I-25 Major Activity Center. The subject site is greater than 5 acres in size. Therefore, it is a shopping center (SC) by definition and is subject to the regulations of Zoning Code §14-16-3-2.

⇒ For more information, please refer to p. 1 and 2 of the original June 18, 2009 Staff report (see attachment).

### ***HISTORY & BACKGROUND***

⇒ Please refer to p. 2-3 of the original June 2009 Staff report (see attachment).

### ***ZONING***

⇒ Please refer to p. 3 of the original June 2009 Staff report (see attachment).

**DEFINITIONS**

⇒ Please refer to p. 4 the original June 2009 Staff report (see attachment).

**POLICY ANALYSIS**

⇒ Please refer to Section III, beginning on p. 4 of the original June 2009 Staff report, for an analysis of conformance to applicable goals and policies (see attachment).

**TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY (TIS)**

⇒ Please refer to Section IV on p. 12 of the original June 2009 Staff report.

**AIR QUALITY IMPACT ANALYSIS (AQIA)**

⇒ Please refer to Section IV on p. 12-13 of the original June 2009 Staff report.

**II. SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR SUBDIVISION (AUGUST 20, 2009 VERSION)**

**OVERVIEW:**

The site development plan for subdivision proposes 21 tracts. Most would be between 3 and 5 acres. Tracts 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21 would not have buildings and would be used as follows: a central commons area (15), PNM (16), the arroyo to the north (17), signage (18-20) and a private roadway (21). The proposed design standards (See Section III of this report) would apply to all tracts.

Zoning Code §14-16-1-5 defines a site development plan for subdivision as follows:

“An accurate plan at a scale of at least 1 inch to 100 feet which covers at least one lot and specifies the site, proposed use, pedestrian and vehicular ingress and egress, any internal circulation requirements and, for each lot, maximum building height, minimum building setback, and maximum total dwelling units and/or nonresidential uses’ maximum floor area ratio.”

The proposed site development plan for subdivision (Sheet AS-101) complies with this definition. The setbacks (20 ft. front and 10 ft. sides and rear) are the same for all tracts and are based on the Industrial Park (IP) zone as the NI25SDP requires. The FARs range from a high of 0.75 for a hotel site to a low of 0.08 for a restaurant site.

**UPDATE:**

*Parking Calculations:* The subject site is not zoned SU-1, so the EPC does not have discretion over parking. Provided minimum requirements are met, additional parking is allowed. Parking is provided in excess of minimum requirements; large fields of parking dominate the proposed site layout.

A table has been added which shows parking calculations by use based on Zoning Code §14-16-3-1. Total parking provided is listed as 3,159 spaces. Staff calculates 2,877 spaces (not 2,876) are required. 3,159 (spaces provided) less 2,877 (spaces required) = 282 spaces (not 283) over minimum requirements. The subject site is overparked by 9% overall (not 10%). Some tracts provide minimum

---

parking, while other tracts are grossly overparked. Any minor calculation errors can be easily corrected.

For procedural purposes, a note needs to be added to Sheet AS-101 stating that: minor variations to parking totals per tract are allowed, provided that the overall number of spaces does not increase. This would allow flexibility while maintaining the integrity of the site development plan. Three new notes have been added. Any revisions to the TIS and change in access points would require consultation with the Traffic Engineer. Cross access easements are granted.

*Other Issues:* Sheets AS-102, AS-102, AS-103 and LS-101 contain a few “clean up” and consistency types of revisions. Notes have been added regarding the existing bus stop and pedestrian connections. The pedestrian symbol needs to be shown underneath the pedestrian network arrows. The arrows need to be lengthened and adjusted in places. An additional pedestrian pathway is needed between tracts 12 and 17, so this northern parking area will be broken up in a similar manner to the way the southern parking areas are broken up.

### **III. SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR SUBDIVISION, DESIGN STANDARDS (AUGUST 20, 2009 VERSION)**

#### ***OVERVIEW***

Design standards create a framework to ensure that a development will further applicable City policies and contribute to making planning goals reality. Design standards establish rules used to review future site development plan(s) for building permit. It is important to ensure that the design standards are clear, well-defined and void of internal inconsistencies.

Design standards contain several sections, typically as follows: Overall Goal/Theme, Site Elements, Pedestrianism, Parking, Setbacks, Landscape, Lighting, Walls/Fences, Utilities, Signage, Architecture and Process. Typically, the EPC considers the specificity and completeness of design standards when contemplating whether or no to delegate its approval authority for future development to the Development Review Board (DRB).

Recall that the proposed design standards must comply with Zoning Code §14-16-3-2, the shopping center (SC) regulations. Also, the subject site is straight-zoned (SU-2/M-1) so the EPC does not have the same discretion as it has when reviewing an SU-1 zoned site.

#### ***PROPOSAL***

⇒ Please refer also to Section VI on p. 13-19 of the original June 2009 Staff report.

The main reason for the deferrals was to continue to improve the proposed design standards. Some issues included several organizational problems (such as related themes not grouped together), lack of order to assist future reviewers and internal inconsistencies.

The proposed design standards were overhauled in preparation for the July hearing. Since then, based on extensive Staff and EPC review, the proposed design standards have been revised and re-organized into August 20, 2009 version, which is reviewed here in the order presented (see Sheets A701 – A706). Updates and revisions to this section of the Staff report are *italicized*.

Note: When reading the revised design standards, underlining (used to indicate new text) is often applied inaccurately. Some underlined language is not new, and some new language is not underlined.

## **1. INTRODUCTION-**

The primary goal is to create a vibrant complex that responds to its surroundings, meets the needs of adjacent properties, improves environmental conditions and complies with the City Zoning Code and ordinances. Sustainable design techniques and green materials are required.

*The sentence regarding “overly rigid requirements” was replaced with a phrase referring to “flexible guideline”. Staff suggests simply using the phrase “provide guidance for future...”.*

### **A. Land Use Concept:**

The land use concept for this SU-2/M-1 zoned site is a business park is to appeal to surrounding areas and provide on-site amenities for the offices. Standard components of “concept” are mentioned, such as pedestrian linkages, unified architecture and landscaping and open space. Minor clarifications regarding zoning and drive-up service windows were needed and provided.

*Language regarding control of the site by the “master developer” has been added. However, the wording is awkward and would benefit from rephrasing. Standard 2a is also awkward. Paragraph 2 needs to be broken out into two paragraphs, since distinct concepts are presented therein, and the section needs to be renumbered.*

### **B. General Site Design:**

Pedestrian activity is a primary focus of the site design and buildings are intended to be oriented to pedestrian movement. Staff suggests breaking out the verbiage about pedestrian walkways, which have been specified as textured, colored concrete for cross walks and street crossings. Much of the specific pedestrian information was incorporated into a separate Pedestrian Features section (see below).

*Language has been added regarding material for the pedestrian walkways, main building entrances and linking buildings to the commons area.*

## **2. PEDESTRIAN FEATURES-**

This section contains a range of pedestrian related topics. The small sections on Sidewalks, Accessibility and Site Furnishings at the end of the standards have been incorporated into this section.

---

Other information placed here is pedestrian connections at parking areas, bicycle connections, bicycle racks, outdoor seating for restaurants and transit.

Safe pedestrian routes and textured, colored concrete shall be used. A bicycle trail, minimum 12 ft. wide, material unspecified, shall be provided along the La Cueva Arroyo to the north. Bicycle storage areas shall be provided “as required”, but they are not required unless required herein.

*Language regarding the materials for pedestrian walkways, bicycle storage and shading has been added. The Bicycle Connections subsection needs to be disentangled and correspondingly re-numbered. The subjective language regarding environments conducive to Transit is unnecessary and should be removed.*

### **3. CENTRAL COMMONS PARK/PLAZA-**

The idea of a central common park/plaza area is a major part of this proposal and should be on the first page of the design standards, especially with the emphasis on pedestrian circulation. The concept is to provide a landscaped area, for all users of the site, to be able to gather and share an open space. There will be turf with pathways, benches, tables and shade trees. Shade trees were added to the main north-south pathway in the middle.

*This section contains an organizational problem. Standards 5 and 6 are overarching and need to be in the section’s introduction, since they don’t mesh conceptually with standards 1-4. The statement that the commons area will consist of 1/3 paved areas is confusing here. The graphic depicting a plaza scene has been removed.*

### **4. ART-**

Public art/sculptures are proposed at unspecified locations throughout the site to promote pedestrianism and wayfinding. There are no standards regarding size or assurance that the art will not function as sign.

*Three new notes have been added to clarify that artwork shall not be used as signage, and not contain advertising or wayfinding information.*

### **5. PARKING/STREETS-**

A separate Parking section was included. Topics addressed are lines of sight, off-street parking landscaping, private ways landscaping, LEV parking and access.

This section should address what is commonly found in design standards, namely generalized parking calculations and maximum parking allowed. Staff notes that maximum parking of 10% over Zoning Code requirements (§14-16-3-1) is common in design standards and should be noted here, especially since the site is 9% overparked in totality. However, this amount of parking won’t contribute to the

---

pedestrian-oriented environment envisioned in Section 1, especially when combined with such large expanses.

Additional language is needed to deal with breaking parking expanses into subareas, deliveries, parking area setbacks, treatment of drive-aisle crossings (ex. on San Mateo Blvd.) and the relationship between parking areas, pedestrian connections and the adjacent streets.

*This section is largely the same. Sentence order in the Introduction subsection has been reversed and a few new words are used. Subsection C needs to be numbered, so that each standard has a unique identifier. The verbiage regarding curb openings and run-off water is new.*

## **6. LANDSCAPING-**

The landscape information is now all in the same place, with the exception of parking lot landscaping which is commonly placed in the Parking section of design standards. The plant palette is now integrated with the landscaping standards and is no longer the last page of the standards.

### **A. Introduction and B. Area Requirements:**

The overall goal is to create places of a human scale that promote people's well being. The proposed landscaping standards comply with Zoning Code requirements (§14-16-3-10) and the requirements of the NI25SDP (see Section VII of the June Staff report), and in instances go beyond these requirements. 20% of net lot area is proposed to be landscaped, though coverage with living, vegetative materials remains at 75%. The amount of allergenic trees proposed, however, may adversely affect some people's well being.

The City Forrester offered extensive comments, regarding Ash species, preference for Arizona Sycamore over London Plane Tree, and specifying Flowering Pear *Pyrus calleryana*, since one cultivar is too restrictive and may not be available, among other comments.

### **C. Landscape Setback Areas:**

The proposed landscape setbacks are based on the IP zone as required in the NI25SDP. Interstate 25 is the front yard, so it has the 20 ft. minimum setback. The other streets have a 10 ft. minimum setback. Illustrations are provided.

*Setbacks have been clarified in the diagrams.*

### **D. Standard Landscape Buffers:**

The same information presented above is reiterated here, with the addition of verbiage regarding the purpose of landscape buffers.

*Clarification has been provided. The Front buffer is along San Mateo Blvd., side buffers are along San Diego and Modesto Aves., and the rear buffer is along I-25. Minimum buffer size is 20 ft., 10 ft. and 10 ft. respectively. Staff believes that a 10 ft. buffer from I-25 is insufficient to ensure safety. The diagram notes the 10 ft. the minimum, though it shows an approx. 35 ft. buffer. Sheet AS-102 buffers*

---

*along I-25 are all approx. 30 ft. Besides is already being provided, this more appropriate minimum standard is needed to fulfill the goal of discouraging pedestrian traffic near I-25.*

**E. Street Trees:**

Street trees shall be provided and shall meet the Street Tree Ordinance requirements.

*There are no changes to the street tree locations. Three types of allergenic trees have been removed from the plant palette.*

**F. Screening:**

In design standards, Screening usually refers to ground-mounted and/or building-mounted utilities. Landscape screening, in this case, shows screening with shrubs and screening with berms.

**G. Landscaping Adjacent to the LaCueva Arroyo:**

This subsection was added to demonstrate compliance with the Facility Plan for Arroyos (FPA). Landscape is intended to be a screening element for the arroyo.

**7. SUSTAINABILITY-**

A variety of sustainable practices are incorporated, such as remediating the site, low-luminance lighting, landscaping practices, storm water harvesting, and re-using construction materials. New buildings less than 200,000 sf will be, at a minimum, LEED certifiable.

The City Forrester offered recommendations regarding water harvesting, including no continuous curbs, un-compacted soil, using parking lot elevations to direct water to planters, and to consider pervious pavement or pavers surrounding all planters in parking and sidewalk areas. Water harvesting and soil amendment are proposed in the design standards, though pervious paving is not.

*The revised bicycle storage language has been added. Clarification has been provided that highly reflective roofs shall be hidden by parapets. The requirement to use green building materials, found in the introductory language on Sheet AS-701, should be included here. Also, the minimum LEED certifiability of buildings should not be limited to buildings under 200,000sf, since apparently LEED requirements are easier to meet the larger a building gets.*

**8. ARCHITECTURAL EXPRESSION-**

**A. Architectural Styles:**

The architectural theme is contemporary. Historical architectural styles, such as Pueblo Revival, Territorial, or Northern New Mexico are prohibited, as is generic franchise design. However, quality treatment on all buildings sides (typical in design standards) is not required, but should be.

*Quality treatment is now required on all building sides, which is a standard requirement in design standards.*



**B. Building Design, Materials & Colors:**

A variety of construction materials is permitted. The color palette is broad and includes shades of brown, grey, green, tan and red. Accent colors are allowed over 20% of the area of the elevation.

*Several revisions have been made. Recessed windows are now defined as 24 inches deep. Shading devices are now allowed. The NI25SDP language regarding loading areas has been added.*

**C. Prohibited Design Elements:**

The list of prohibited design elements includes large, blank, unarticulated wall surfaces, some fencing elements (which belong in the Screening section), untreated block walls and pitched roofs on office buildings, etc.

*Staff recommends that untreated block walls not be allowed, especially since this development is supposed to be a classy destination.*

**D. Building Heights:**

This information, formerly in the Miscellaneous section, was placed here. The diagram depicts allowable building height in the M-1 zone.

**9. SIGNAGE-**

**A. General Standards:**

Several types of signage are proposed: free-standing signs, project identification signs, pedestrian-oriented signs and building wall signs (also called building mounted signs). Logo signs are also allowed, though they are not addressed separately.

Terminology should match the Zoning Code for consistency's sake. Free-standing signs and building-mounted signs are defined terms. It is unclear what is meant by pedestrian-oriented sign, whether this would be a directional sign for wayfinding or an additional free-standing monument sign. Clarification, including the size, materials and colors, was needed for the pedestrian-oriented signs. Off-premise signs are not permitted on shopping center sites.

Many of the proposed general guidelines are from the Zoning Code. Others include limiting colors and materials to 3 (now it's 5) different kinds and limiting typefaces. Definition is needed for "overly ornate" typeface.

All signage must comply with Zoning Code §14-16-3-2, the Shopping Center (SC) Regulations, which state that one free-standing sign is allowed for every 300 ft. of street frontage on arterial and collector streets (which are Interstate 25 and San Mateo Blvd.). Maximum sign size is 150 sf and 26 ft. high.

Free-standing monument signs are proposed on every tract except for Tracts 16 (PNM), 17, 18 and 21, which would not have signs. Pursuant to the SC regulations, the subject site would be allowed 10 free-standing signs  $[3,090 \text{ of street frontage}/300 = 10.3, \text{ or } 10]$ , calculated based on I-25 and San Mateo frontage. The table on the left (recently deleted) was numerically correct; 1,500 sf of signage maximum would be allowed. Tracts 19 and 20 would have project identification signs, 300 sf and 900 sf respectively, featuring the name of the project. However, these signs would be much larger than the 150 sf allowed pursuant to the SC regulations.

Because the subject site is zoned SU-2/M-1 (not SU-1) the EPC does not have discretion to allow signage in excess of Zoning Code requirements or to allow types of signage not specified in the Code (such as directional signage). The applicant is requesting 2,520 sf of signage, which is 1,020 sf more of signage than the Zoning Code allows. Staff suggests that the applicant comply with the SC regulations as required and re-think the proposed signage locations.

*The most significant changes are to the Signage standards. Now, signage will comply with the Shopping Center (SC) regulations. Subsection A-General Standards has some organizational problems (ex. general statements listed alongside specific requirements) and is poorly written in places (ex. Standard 11). However, these can be easily remedied.*

*The standard 70% contrast between graphic and background will be provided. However, up to 5 (was 3) different colors would now be allowed per sign. Electronic display panels (not digital billboards) should be expressly prohibited.*

#### **B. Free-Standing Signage:**

A sample monument sign is shown. Free-standing signs shall not exceed 26 ft. in height. This section states that all free-standing signage is pursuant to the M-1 and C-2 zones. However, the subject site is a shopping center (SC) site by definition and is required to comply with the SC regulations.

*Two monument sign types, single tenant and multi-tenant, are now shown. However, these sign details could easily be enlarged (and scaled) for ease of reading. A uniform color and style is now depicted. Now, free-standing signs shall be perpendicularly oriented to the roadway, not encroach clear sight triangles and shall not have a single pole base. The tables, which specified sign size, location and quantity, have been removed. The note regarding deeming the site plan amended, in the event of a variance approval by the Zoning Hearing Examiner (ZHE), has been added.*

#### **C. Building-Mounted Signage Along Freeway & D. Building-Mounted Signage at Office:**

These small sub-sections provide sample illustrations and a couple of standards each and are now in the building mounted signage subsection. Logo signs are insufficiently addressed.

Building-mounted signage is proposed to not exceed 10% of the façade area to which it is applied. For tracts with monument signs, building mounted signage will not exceed 5% of the façade area. These items are now listed in the building mounted signage subsection.

---

*Building mounted signage has become its own subsection and is now found on Sheet A-706. Included is signage interior to the site, along the freeway and on office buildings. Wall mounted signs shall not be illuminated adjacent to residential development and are not allowed on canopies or awnings. Retail tenants are allowed building mounted signs on 2 sides of the building they occupy.*

*There is a new subsection for Vehicular and Pedestrian Directional Signage and a new Signage Location Map. The new subsection has organizational problems; the general requirements lack a heading and the numbering is incorrect. Though easily remedied, correction is necessary to provide clarity in the future. Directional signs, informational signs, street signs and transit sign types are shown.*

#### **E. Project Identification-Site Signage:**

Three project identification signs are proposed, two along the freeway and one at San Mateo/Modesto. Colors, materials, lighting and design are unspecified.

*The revised subsection on project identification signage is found on Sheet AS-705. This subsection needs a letter heading and associated numbering, so each standard can be readily-identified. Three signage sizes, 60 sf (east, middle of site), 90 sf (SW corner of site) and 150 sf (NE corner of site), are now proposed. All are made of non-reflective green metal and painted with a powder-coat.*

#### **10. LIGHTING-**

The lighting standards aim to enhance safety, security and aesthetics of the area while maintaining “dark skies.” There are three, small sub-sections: street lighting, parking lot and building exterior lighting, and pedestrian lighting.

Street lighting shall not exceed 25 ft. tall, which needs to be specified as measured from top to grade. 15 ft. is the maximum for walkway lighting, 3 ft. for bollard lighting. High-efficiency, high brightness LED lighting is required.

*New lighting details, which show the style of lighting for light poles and bollard lights, have been provided. Notes have been added to state that lighting shall not conflict with landscaping and that high-pressure sodium lighting is prohibited (a standard note). Minor revisions are suggested.*

#### **11. WALLS/FENCES-**

Though brief, a Walls/Fences section has been added which is a typical component of design standards. Walls are proposed to generally only be used as screening elements. A perimeter wall is not proposed around the subject site or its tracts.

*“Yard walls”, an undefined term, are prohibited. Clarification and/or another term should be used. Chain link fencing should be prohibited, which normal in design standards. Chain link is even less appropriate here because this development is supposed to be a classy destination.*

## **12. UTILITIES-**

A utilities section has been added and includes typical topics such as mechanical screening, equipment and trash enclosures.

*Language has been added regarding screening of ground-mounted transformers.*

## **13. PROCESS-**

The process section, a critical component of design standards, has been added. The applicant is requesting delegation of approval authority for future development to the Development Review Board (DRB). Therefore, it is critical that the proposed design standards be thorough, specific, void of internal inconsistencies, and well-organized to facilitate future review.

*The process section has been removed, which is not advisable. Future reviewers will look for a Process section, since it is standard procedure to include this section. Furthermore, since delegation is being requested, a Process section is critical to ensuring that everyone has the same idea of what the future approval process will be. Silence on this topic, via the absence of a standard Process section, is not recommended.*

## **CONCLUSION:**

In sum, Staff finds that the proposed design standards have improved and are better organized, though some organizational issues remain. In response to the EPC's suggestions, details have been provided and the signage section has been greatly revised. A review of the accompanying site development plan for building permit using the proposed design standards is found in Section V of this report.

Staff continues to recommend that the next site development plan for building permit return to the EPC. At that time, the EPC can re-evaluate if delegation is warranted for future development on the remaining tracts. Please refer to p. 16-17 of this report for a discussion of the delegation issue.

## **IV. SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR SUBDIVISION- ANALYSIS OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE DESIGN STANDARDS IN THE NORTH I-25 SECTOR DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

⇒ Please refer to Section VII, p. 19-22 of the original June 18, 2009 Staff report (see attachment).

## **V. ANALYSIS- SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR BUILDING PERMIT (AUGUST 20, 2009 VERSION)**

This second supplemental Staff report addresses (in re-cap form) topics previously discussed, yet focuses on revisions made during the most recent deferral period.

---

⇒ Please refer to p. 9-12 of the first supplemental Staff report and to p. 22-27 of the original Staff report for additional analysis (see attachments).

Updates and revisions in this second supplemental Staff report are *italicized*. [no revisions] indicates that there have been no changes during the most recent deferral period. Please note the following:

⇒ The Grading & Drainage Plan and the Utility Plan do not contain revisions.

⇒ Underlining (used for new text) is often inaccurately applied. Some underlined language is not new, and some new language is not underlined.

***Site Plan Layout / Configuration***

The applicant proposes a 60,000 sf, three-story office building on an approx. 4 acre site. The proposed building would be oriented east-west and located behind the existing PNM substation.

***Height***

The M-1 zone requires that height and width of a structure over 26 ft. fall within 45 degree angle planes drawn from the horizontal at the mean grade along each internal boundary of the premises and each adjacent public right-of-way centerline [Zoning Code §14-16-2-15(C)(1)]. The internal street (Tract 21), is proposed to be private (not public) so there is no public ROW centerline to measure from and no conflict with this provision (previously, a variance would have been needed). Because the subject site is not zoned SU-1, the EPC does not have discretion regarding building height.

*A height diagram has now been provided on Sheet #1 and shows compliance with allowable height in the M-1 zone (up to 120 ft. provided that the angle plane requirement is met). The height of the proposed building, which has not changed, is 46.5 ft. at the roofline. Corner elements extend to 48.5 ft. tall.*

***Refuse Enclosure*** [no revisions]

The dumpster area, relocated from the center of the site to the northern portion of the parking lot, was replaced with a small plaza area. A recycle area and two double enclosures, or a compactor, were required by the Solid Waste Management Department. The applicant opted for the compactor.

***Walls/Fences*** [no revisions]

The color of the proposed refuse enclosure walls and metal panels has been specified as tan to match the building.

***Parking*** [no revisions]

The site continues to be characterized by large expanses of parking. Parking requirements are 210 spaces based on the office use [Zoning Code §14-16-3-1]. 266 spaces are provided. One space was lost due to the revised trash enclosure location. The required amounts of handicap, motorcycle, and bicycle parking are provided. 13 spaces for low emission vehicles (LEVs) are also provided near the building's main entrance.

The subject site is not zoned SU-1 (Zoning Code §14-16-2-22), so the EPC does not have discretion to allow parking below minimum Zoning Code requirements. In this case, proposed parking is well in excess of minimum requirements. The site is over parked by 21 percent without the 10 percent transit reduction (which would make the site over parked by 29 percent.)

***Pedestrian and Bicycle Access and Circulation, Transit Access***

The proposed sidewalks and enhanced paving at crossings will help facilitate non-vehicular circulation, though they cannot entirely mitigate the vehicle-oriented nature of the site layout. The sidewalk along the building's primary entrance was widened to 13 ft. and complies with Zoning Code §14-16-3-18(C)(1)(b). Enhanced paving, proposed across drive aisles, was defined as textured, colored concrete. Bumpers need to be added along the west-east sidewalk to prevent overhang (Code Enforcement comment). The primary entrance sidewalk is sufficiently wide to not need wheel stops.

*Notes have been added regarding bicycle storage and parking. 2 bicycle racks (not 11) are proposed, which amounts to 14 bicycle spaces. 11 bicycle spaces are required. Indoor bicycle storage is listed as 4, while total bicycle storage is listed as 18 (counting the bicycle spaces).*

*"Bicycle storage inside of a building" is a separate concept and should not be convoluted with standardized bicycle parking requirements. Bicycle parking and bicycle storage are not the same thing; Staff has never seen bicycle parking dealt with in this unnecessarily cumbersome manner.*

*As standard procedure, bicycle spaces must be provided in the form of bicycle racks required pursuant to §14-16-1-3 (the site is not zoned SU-1 so there is no discretion over parking). The idea of tying indoor bicycle storage to building square footage was discussed at the hearing, but the applicant did not follow up. The "3% of building occupants" for bicycle storage (meaning parking and storage) is confusing.*

*Staff suggests that bicycle parking be provided pursuant to the Zoning Code and that indoor bicycle storage be provided at a minimum rate of 1 per 15,000 sf of building area. This results in 4 indoor bicycle storage spaces, which is what the applicant is proposing. The design standards need to incorporate this information.*

***Lighting & Security***

The light fixtures are 20 ft. tall pole mounted lights. Height to grade measurement, color and finish need to be specified. The City Forester had commented that proposed Eastern Redbud trees in the southern parking lot could conflict with proposed light poles, a comment also made by the Police Department. The Redbud trees were replaced with Lacebark Elm trees.

*New details for light poles, pedestrian-scale lighting and bollard lighting are provided. All incorporate the green color scheme and an updated design. Light poles are now proposed to measure 25 ft. (not 20 ft.) from top to grade, though this needs to be noted in the narrative of the design standards.*

### ***Landscaping Plan***

The number of street trees required (14) and provided (15) is shown. Trees proposed near the PNM substation are short varieties that won't interfere with existing power lines. Additional plant material was added to the southwestern corner, areas near the northern vehicular entrance, and near the building to ensure that the minimum requirement for 75% coverage with living, vegetative material is met.

The City Forester made several comments. One comment, which has not been addressed, is to widen the planters with 2 Ash trees in the center of each parking area. If the planters are made 17 feet wider, they would provide greater rooting volume for tree health, water holding capacity, and more shade. Since the site is overparked by 21%, requirements could still easily be met if some parking spaces are used to benefit the trees (and people). Also, the NI25SDP requires that plantings provide shade for pedestrians and buildings (p. 54).

The City Forester also commented regarding water harvesting potential on the site's SW corner and that the proposed irrigation system would not be sufficient (each tree should have 3-5 bubblers instead of only one). Previous revisions included a note regarding inverted crown use in landscape islands and 3 bubblers per tree and 1 per shrub.

*The tree planters in the back patio area have increased from 49 sf to 64 sf and now comply with the design standards. The parking area planters (with the Ash trees) measure approx. 280 sf each, though the label indicates 180 sf. No change has been made since the original submittal, so the Forrester's comment remains unaddressed. Staff suggests increasing the planter size by 16 ft. – 8 ft. on each side.*

*New notes have been added (#14-#18) that reiterate some of the landscape design standards. An overarching statement that the landscaping plan will comply with the design standards is needed. Three plants were removed from the planting totals, though overall coverage appears to be quite similar. Highly allergenic trees are now limited to two species per site plan.*

### ***Architecture & Design***

Some minor revisions were previously made. The words "or have a highly reflective surface" have been added to a note on Sheet 1 to comply with the Design Standards. Exterior, common-name colors for the building were specified.

*As standard procedure, site development plans for building permit address color as follows: common name color and/or paint manufacturer color number. Previously, common name color was called out. Now, color has reverted to a "range". "Shades of light brown, tan or beige" is highly variable and has very little chance of matching the color elevations (which probably should not be color, for that matter). It is not possible to know what is being proposed. The applicant, like all other applicants, needs to specify common name color at a minimum as was done previously.*

The Design Standards for All Non-Residential Uses found Zoning Code §14-16-3-18 (D)(2) have still not been met. The proposed building is approx. 242 ft. long by 86 ft. long. Major facades greater than 100 ft. in length (the eastern and western elevations) are required to break up building mass by applying two of the seven design options listed:

- 
- a. wall plane projections/recesses at least every 100 ft.
  - b. vertical change in color, texture or material every 50 ft.
  - c. an offset, reveal, pilaster or projecting element at least every 50 ft.
  - d. cornice or base treatments,
  - e. art coordinated through the City's art program,
  - f. change in parapet height for every 100 ft. in length, or
  - g. any other treatment that meets the intent of this section.

*The proposed building is made of aluminum panels, in one main color with two accent colors. The eastern elevation, which faces the common area, meets (c) by providing projecting building elements at least every 50 ft. It does not meet (b) because the vertical changes in color and material must occur every 50 ft. The middle section of the building is the same for approx. 144 ft. (a) is not met because this middle 144 ft. does not have a wall plane projection (see Sheet #1).*

*The western elevation, which features the building's main entrance, also meets (c) by providing projecting building elements at least every 50 ft. It does not meet (a) because approx. 144 ft. occur before there is a wall plane projection (see Sheet #1).*

The proposed building does not comply with Zoning Code minimum requirements for design. The applicant has requested the exception found in §14-16-3-18(D)(h): "In cases where the applicant has provided pedestrian amenities according to Section 14-16-3-18(C)(2) above, the applicant need only provide one of the above-listed treatments." The proposed trees along each elevation [see (C)(2)(f)] are considered a pedestrian amenity and are provided.

*Staff finds that the primary (western side) elevation and the eastern elevation (facing the common area) would benefit from adding an additional design feature each, particularly since the proposed development is supposed to be a high-quality destination. Quality can be created by exceeding minimal requirements.*

### ***Signage***

A monument sign, 4 ft. tall by 7.5 ft. wide (29 sf per side), is proposed near the building's northwest corner. The color is now specified as tan with black metal lettering. No building mounted signs are proposed.

*There are several changes. Details, which match the color and material theme as shown in the design standards, are now provided for the monument sign, directional sign and transit sign (see Sheet #1.1). The material is now painted aluminum. Colors are now green for the background, with an orange accent, and grey for the sign face. Letters are black, raised metal.*

*The proposed monument sign is 6.5 ft. wide and 4.5 ft. tall (1 ft. less wide and 0.5 ft. taller). Two directional signs, recently added, are proposed at San Mateo Blvd.- on the northwestern corner of the site and near the middle of the site. The directional sign seems to be another monument sign except for the arrows.*



*Directional signs are proposed along San Mateo probably because the design standards state that directional signs “do not count” toward the number of free-standing monument signs allowed pursuant to the SC regulations. If directional signs are to be used like directional signs, it would seem logical to place them nearer to the business(es) and place the actual monument sign nearer to the roadway. The design standards show that an informational sign, not a directional sign, is proposed near the middle of the site.*

*Building-mounted signage (150 sf each) is proposed on the building’s southern and western (primary) elevations. The monument signs and the building mounted signs mostly comply with the design standards. Regarding the informational sign, transit sign and building-mounted sign specifics, information is insufficient so compliance cannot be determined.*

### **Outdoor Space**

Zoning Code §14-16-3-18(C)(3) requires outdoor seating for major façades greater than 100 ft. in length. Calculations were previously added (see Sheet 1). The proposed concrete benches are the minimum size, and are found at the outdoor seating area and in back (eastern elevation) of the proposed building. Staff suggested that a bench be added to the main (western) elevation, close to the entrance.

Zoning Code §14-16-3-18(C)(4) requires a public space area (minimum 400 sf) for buildings 60,000 sf or greater. Calculations have been added to Sheet 1. An outdoor seating area is proposed on the east side of the building. The proposed trees have been changed from Eastern Redbud, at the City Forester’s suggestion. A 375 sf. plaza, with two benches, was added previously to the center of the site where the dumpster used to be.

*A bench has been added to the main (western) elevation, close to the entrance. Now 34 outdoor seats (not 30) are proposed. All benches are the same type, plain concrete that is 1.25 ft. high and 2 ft. wide.*

## **VI. SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR BUILDING PERMIT- ANALYSIS OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE DESIGN STANDARDS IN THE NORTH I-25 SECTOR DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

⇒ Please refer to Section IX, p. 28-30 of the original June 18, 2009 Staff report (see attachment).

## **VII. SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR BUILDING PERMIT- ANALYSIS OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE PROPOSED DESIGN STANDARDS FOR THE NORTH I-25 CORPORATE CENTER**

### **COMPLIANCE**

The proposed site development plan for building permit for Tract 13 must comply with the proposed design standards for the North I-25 Corporate Center. Staff review consists of re-reading the design standards, line by line, and comparing them to the site development plan for building permit and noting inconsistencies between the two.

### *Recap*

Staff analysis for the July hearing revealed that this first site development plan for building permit (the “test case”) contained several instances of non-compliance with the design standards, which perhaps could have been addressed had the applicant performed a similar review. There were also instances in which the design standards needed adjustment to more closely match the building and site proposed.

There were two main areas in which the proposed site development plan for building permit did not comply with the proposed design standards: sustainability (Section 7, Sheet A-704) and architectural expression (Section 8, Sheet A-704). Other instances of non-compliance were found in landscaping (Section 6, Sheets A-702 and A-703) and lighting (Section 10, Sheet A-706).

### *Update*

Compliance with the proposed design standards has improved overall. However, inconsistencies between the two site development plans remain and conditions of approval are needed to reconcile them. In some instances, the standard has not been implemented (ex. water harvesting, informational signage). In other instances, information is insufficient to determine compliance.

### **DELEGATION**

The remaining inconsistencies between the two submitted site development plans, even with extensive input from Staff and the EPC, demonstrate that delegation of approval authority to the DRB is not warranted at this time. The first test case, a site development plan for building permit on Tract 13, continues to not comply sufficiently with the proposed design standards to warrant delegation of approval authority.

The next site development plan for building permit should return to the EPC before approval authority is delegated to a technical body, the DRB, which does not specialize in this type of review and clean up. The EPC is the appropriate forum for the applicant to demonstrate that they can achieve compliance with the design standards on their own, and that they can ensure consistency between the site development plans. This demonstration has not yet occurred. The delegation issue can, and should, be revisited at the time of the next submittal.

## **VIII. ADDITIONAL ITEMS**

### ***Concerns of Reviewing Agencies/Pre-Hearing Discussion***

⇒ Please refer to p. 30 of the original June 2009 Staff report (see attachment).

### ***Neighborhood Concerns***

Four neighborhood organizations were required to be notified: the Noreste Neighborhood Association (NRENA), the Wildflower Area NA (WFANA), the District 4 Coalition of Neighborhood Associations and the North Valley Coalition (NVC). The applicant notified them as required.

⇒ Please refer to p. 30-31 of the original June 2009 Staff report (see attachment).

Staff received a letter from the Wildflower Area NA, with whom the applicant has been working to address traffic and safety-related concerns. This letter is attached to the first supplemental Staff report.

## **IX. CONCLUSION**

This two-part proposal is for a site development plan for subdivision, with design standards, and a site development plan for building permit for an approx. 60 acre site, zoned SU-2/M-1, between San Mateo Blvd. and I-25, and between San Diego Ave. and Modesto Ave.

The applicant proposes to develop mostly office uses, but also a bank (retail), a hotel and restaurants, to be known as the North I-25 Corporate Center. The proposed site development plan for subdivision would create 21 tracts and design standards. The proposed site development plan for building permit is for an office building just east of the existing electrical substation.

The North Valley Area Plan, the Facility Plan for Arroyos and the North I-25 Sector Development Plan apply. Overall the proposal furthers and partially furthers most applicable policies. Agency comments were extensive. Many have been addressed. A facilitated meeting was held on June 2, 2009. Neighbors expressed concern, mostly about traffic and safety issues.

The proposed design standards have improved by adding some of the information discussed previously. However, other information has not been added and many errors are found throughout. Some compliance issues remain. Therefore, delegation of approval authority to the DRB is not advisable at this time. Despite extensive guidance, numerous inconsistencies between the two submitted site development plans remain. Also, the applicant has not demonstrated, on their own, that they can create consistency and compliance between a site development plan for building permit and the design standards that govern it.

Staff recommends approval of both requests, subject to several conditions needed to create compliance and remedy inconsistencies.

***FINDINGS -09EPC 40021, September 10, 2009-Site Development Plan for Subdivision***

1. The subject request is for a site development plan for subdivision for Signetics Albuquerque Facility, Tract A, Unit B, North Albuquerque Acres, an approximately 60 acre site located between San Mateo Boulevard and Interstate 25, and between San Diego Avenue and Modesto Avenue, zoned SU-2 for M-1.
2. The applicant proposes to subdivide the subject site into 21 tracts. Most would be between 3 and 5 acres. Design standards are proposed and delegation of approval authority to the Development Review Board (DRB) is requested.
3. This request accompanies a request for a site development plan for building permit for an approx. 60,000 sf office building on the proposed Tract 13 (09EPC-40020).
4. Because the subject site is greater than 5 acres in size, it is a Shopping Center (SC) site by definition and is subject to the regulations of Zoning Code §14-16-3-2.
5. The Comprehensive Plan, the North Valley Area Plan, the Facility Plan for Arroyos, the Trails and Bikeways Facility Plan and the North I-25 Sector Development Plan are incorporated herein by reference and are made part of the record for all purposes.
6. The Economic Development Goal and Policy II.C.6a are furthered. Overall, the request would facilitate development of various office, institutional and commercial uses that is diversified and balanced with some environmental goals (Goal). The request would create new jobs which generally have a wide range of skills and salary levels in an area where more job opportunities are needed (Policy 6a).
7. The Transportation and Transit Goal and Transit Policy 4g are partially furthered. The placement of employment and services is generally inefficient in this location with limited transit service. Pedestrian connections are proposed, though large expanses of parking complicate non-vehicle circulation (Goal). Though addressed, non-vehicle modes were not integrated as part of the design concept but were added after the site layout was defined (Policy 4g).
8. The request furthers the following Comprehensive Plan policies:

- 
- A. Policy II.B.5a-full range of urban land uses. Office, retail and hotel uses would generally introduce more land use variety to the area.
  - B. Policy II.B.5j-location of new commercial development. The subject site, already zoned for the proposed uses, is in reasonable walking and bicycling distance from the neighborhood and can be considered a larger, area-wide shopping center site by definition.
  - C. Policy II.B.5l-quality design/new development. The design of the proposed development would be appropriate for the Plan area and would generally provide for quality and innovation.
  - D. Policy II.B.5p-cost effective rehabilitation techniques. The proposal would result in privately funded redevelopment, which can be considered a cost-effective redevelopment technique since it does not use public funds (technique #1).

9. The request partially furthers the following Comprehensive Plan policies:

- A. Policy II.B.5d-neighborhood values/environmental conditions/resources. Neighbors believe that the intensity of the proposed uses will exacerbate traffic problems and may affect scenic resources. The proposed design would not contrast sharply with the mostly industrial setting and recreational opportunities would be provided.
- B. Policy II.B.5i-employment/service use location. The location would generally complement the existing residential area and would be separated from it by roadways. The proposed buildings are mostly located in the center of the subject site, which would generally minimize effects of noise and lighting. However, traffic impacts may adversely affect the existing residential area.
- C. Policy II.B.5m-site design/unique vistas. Re-using a site generally improves the quality of the visual environment, which is the case here. However, the proposed layout would not necessarily maintain and enhance the unique views of the Sandia Mountains.

10. Regarding the North Valley Area Plan (NVAP), the request furthers the following applicable Goals:

- A. General Goal 6. The subject site is located in an established commercial/industrial area and is zoned to allow the proposed uses. The proposed design standards would generally encourage quality re-development.
- B. General Goal 11. The subject site is located in the I-25 corridor, which is an appropriate location for commercial and industrial development.

11. The request partially furthers the following applicable NVAP policies:

- A. Transportation Policy 2. The request would provide pedestrian/bicycle circulation opportunities, but the site layout emphasizes parking and vehicular circulation. Transit service is limited in this part of the Plan area.
- B. Community Design Policy 3b: The request is generally consistent with the uses envisioned in the Plan for the North I-25 subarea, though more consideration could be given to potential neighborhood impacts such as traffic.

12. Regarding the Facility Plan for Arroyos (FPA), the request complies with the following relevant design guidelines for Major Open Space Link Arroyos:

- A. Policy 1a- Building Orientation. Buildings are required to have windows on the northern sides that look toward the La Cueva Arroyo.
- B. Policy 3-Parking & Service Areas. Pedestrian and bicycle access are provided across the parking lots, to the trail along the arroyo. Landscaping along the arroyo would consist of shrubs and trees and function as a screening element.
- C. Landscaping Policy 1. Landscaping adjacent to the arroyo would consist of shrubs and drought-resistant shade trees.

13. A Traffic Impact Study (TIS) and an Air Quality Impact Assessment (AQIA) were required. Both have been completed. Concerning the TIS, coordination with the State Department of Transportation continues regarding the location of access points on Interstate 25.

14. The proposed design standards warrant revisions to provide clarity and specificity to benefit future reviewers, which can be achieved with the incorporation of the Conditions of Approval. Delegation of approval authority to the DRB is not warranted at this time, but will be reconsidered when the next site development plan for building permit comes before the EPC.

15. The Noreste Neighborhood Association (NRENA), the Wildflower Area NA (WFANA), the District 4 Coalition of Neighborhood Associations and the North Valley Coalition (NVC) were notified. A facilitated meeting was held on June 2, 2009. Neighbors expressed concern, mostly about traffic issues and the TIS. Staff has received one comment letter from a neighbor. An adjacent property owner submitted a letter of general support.

16. The EPC does not object to the total number of parking spaces (3,159).

***RECOMMENDATION - 09EPC 40021, September 10, 2009***

**APPROVAL of 09EPC 40021, a Site Development Plan for Subdivision for Signetics Albuquerque Facility, Tract A, Unit B, North Albuquerque Acres, an approximately 60 acre site zoned SU-2 for M-1, located between San Mateo Boulevard and Interstate-25, and between San Diego Avenue and Modesto Avenue, based on the preceding Findings and subject to the following Conditions of Approval.**

***CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -09EPC 40021, September 10, 2009- Site Development Plan for Subdivision***

1. The EPC delegates final sign-off authority of this site development plan to the Development Review Board (DRB). The DRB is responsible for ensuring that all EPC Conditions have been satisfied and that other applicable City requirements have been met. A letter shall accompany the submittal, specifying all modifications that have been made to the site plan since the EPC hearing, including how the site plan has been modified to meet each of the EPC conditions. Unauthorized changes to this site plan, including before or after DRB final sign-off, may result in forfeiture of approvals.
2. Prior to final DRB sign off, the applicant shall meet with the Staff planner to ensure that conditions of approval are met. Evidence of this meeting shall be provided to the DRB at the time of application.
3. The subject site shall be replatted.

**Sheet AS-101, Site Development Plan for Subdivision:**

4. Parking:
  - A. A note shall be added to indicate that minor variations to parking totals per tract are allowed provided that the overall number of spaces does not increase.
  - B. The Land Use Summary verbiage shall be updated to correspond to the previously revised parking calculations.
  - C. Total parking required pursuant to the Zoning Code shall be listed as 2,877 and the difference between parking required and provided shall be listed as 282.

- D. The “percentage difference overall” between parking required and parking provided shall be listed as 9%.

Sheet AS-103, Pedestrian Plan:

5. Materials

- A. Pedestrian walkways that cross parking areas shall be made of: 1) textured or colored concrete, or 2) thermoplastic or similar material.
- B. Plain grey or black concrete, which blends in with parking lot asphalt colors, shall not be used. Concrete must be textured and plainly visible as it crosses parking lot areas.

6. Walkways:

- A. A north-south pedestrian walkway shall be added between Tract 12 and Tract 7 (to break up the large parking area).
- B. An east-west pedestrian walkway shall be added to connect the use on Tract 5 to the businesses on Tract 2.

7. Network consistency and “clean up”:

- A. In all instances where the pedestrian network is shown, a pedestrian connection (colored, hatched area) shall be shown underneath it.
- B. The arrows depicting pedestrian walkways shall align with the walkways and, if necessary, be extended to cover the length of the walkways.
- C. The pedestrian walkways adjacent to the buildings on Tracts 8-11 shall be shown with the green highlighting (individual business pedestrian walkway access).

8. Conceptual Landscape Plan, Sheet LS-101:

- A. Pedestrian pathways shall be depicted in the same locations as shown on the Pedestrian Plan (Sheet AS-103).
- B. High water use turf shall be permitted, [as no more than 40% of a turf blend mix], in the central commons park/plaza.



---

Sheet A-701:

9. Introductory Language:

The first sentence in paragraph 2 shall read as follows: “The purpose of these design standards is to provide a ~~flexible guideline~~ [+guidance+] for future ~~design~~ [+development+].

10. Introduction- Land Use Concept:

- A. Standard A1 shall read as follows: “It is the intent of the master developer of the site to maintain control of the developed site through the development process and asset ownership. Maintenance of the common area and each landscaped areas on individual tracts will be under the purview and oversight of a management entity controlled by the master development per the covenants, rules and restrictions to be established for the master development.”
- B. Standard A2, which discusses three distinct topics, shall be separated into three standards. The phrase “The two drive aisles...” shall start the new Standard 2 and the phrase “Key points” shall start the new Standard 3. Subsequent standards shall be renumbered accordingly.
- C. The renumbered Standard 5a (was 2a) shall read as follows: “Food and drink ~~drive-thru facilities for off-site consumption~~ [+uses with drive up service windows+] ~~shall not be permitted (per existing zoning)~~ [+are not allowed pursuant to the subject site’s current zoning (SU-2/M-1)+] ~~unless permitted in future sector plans for the area~~ [+and will not be permitted unless allowed by a future, applicable sector development plan.+]”
- D. The following corrections shall be made: renumbered Standard 7- use the word “requirements” instead of “guidelines”, and renumbered Standard 8- use “pursuant to” instead of “per.”

11. Introduction- General Site Design:

- A. The phrase “whenever possible” shall be removed from Standard B4. Shared entries are encouraged.
- B. It shall be specified herein (as it is on Sheet AS-101) that the pedestrian crossing leading to the Wildflower neighborhood shall be made of textured, colored concrete.
- C. Standard B.9 shall read as follows: “Pedestrian connections shall link buildings to [+any small plaza areas on individual tracts and to+] the [+larger+]central commons park/plaza.” [NVAP].
- D. Plain grey or black concrete, which blends in with parking lot asphalt colors, shall not be used. Concrete must be textured and plainly visible as it crosses parking lot areas.

12. Pedestrian Features:

- A. The term “enhanced paving” shall be used consistently and shall replace references to “accent paving” and “decorative paving.”
- B. Plain grey or black concrete, which blends in with parking lot asphalt colors, shall not be used. Concrete must be textured and plainly visible as it crosses parking lot areas.
- C. The following explanation shall be added to the statement that “Pedestrian traffic shall be discouraged along the Pan American freeway” [+through the use of wide landscape buffers. See Section 6.D1 of these standards+].”

13. Bicycles:

- A. The Bicycle Connections subsection shall be broken into items “1. Connections near Arroyos”, and “2. Connections throughout the Site”.
- B. The pathway along the arroyo on the subject site’s northern side shall have a separate bicycle lane that does not conflict with pedestrian traffic.
- C. The design standards shall differentiate between bicycle parking (using bicycle racks outside) and bicycle storage inside of a building. Bicycle parking, required in the Zoning Code, shall not be counted as bicycle storage.
- D. The sentence “Bicycle storage must include the number of outdoor bicycle racks required by the City of Albuquerque” shall be deleted.
- E. Bicycle storage inside of a building shall be provided at the rate of 1 space for every 15,000 sf of GLSF. [note: the site development plan for building permit provides this].

14. Commons Area:

- A. The statement “The Commons area shall be composed of approx. 1/3 paved areas and 2/3 landscaped areas” shall be deleted. [no buildings are proposed on Tract 15]
- B. The overarching Standards A.5 and A.6 shall be moved up to the introductory paragraph of this Section.
- C. The separate standard regarding lighting shall be broken out from Standard 4 and shall become a new Standard 5. Standard 7 shall be renumbered Standard 6.

---

Sheet A-702:

15. Parking/Streets:

Subsection C shall be broken out into 1. Trees... and 2. Parking and Drive Aisles.... The subpoints under 1 shall be called out with small letters (not numbers).

Sheet A-702 and Sheet A-703:

16. Landscaping- general:

- A. The minimum size of tree planter wells shall be 64 sf and shall be noted in this Section.
- B. The minimum width of the landscape buffer along I-25 shall be 30 ft., as shown on Sheet AS-102, AS-103 and LS-101. The illustration shall be correspondingly updated.

17. Landscaping- plant palette:

- A. All Buffalo juniper shall be female.
- B. High water use turf shall be limited to no more than 40% of the turf blend used.

Sheet A-704:

18. Sustainability:

- A. The sentence "Bicycle storage must include the number of outdoor bicycle racks required by the City of Albuquerque" shall be deleted. (Standard 7.G)
- B. Bicycle storage inside of a building shall be provided at the rate of 1 space for every 15,000 sf of GLSF. [note: this is what the site development plan for building permit provides]. (Standard 7.G)
- C. All new buildings will be at a minimum LEED certifiable.
- D. Green building materials shall be required [note: language found in the introduction, should be under Sustainability as well].

19. Architectural Expression:

- A. The following phrase shall be modified : "...and ~~the overall~~ [+these+] design standards ~~of the master plan~~".

- B. Standard C.4, regarding block walls, shall be dealt with in the Walls/Fences section.
- C. Standard B.13 shall read verbatim from the NI25SDP, p. 53, as follows: "All loading areas used for loading and unloading of commercial vehicles shall be setback from the public right of way [+line+] and from all property lines to reduce the visual impact of large commercial vehicles ~~in~~ [+and+] loading areas."
- D. Large, block like structures having long, uninterrupted exterior walls are prohibited (Standard 8.C2). Long shall be defined as 100 feet or greater. [ref: ZC §14-16-3-18].

Sheet A-705:

20. Signage- general:

- A. The following language shall be reinstated: "All signage shall be designed to be consistent and complement the materials, colors and architecture of the building and/or site location."
- B. Add the following phrase to Standard A.2: "All signage shall be designed with a minimum 70% contrast between graphic and background [+in all respects+]."
- C. "Overly ornate" type shall be defined.
- D. Standard A.11 shall be re-written as follows: "~~There shall be compliance with any applicable federal regulations relating to the interstate in terms of signage~~". [+Signage shall comply with applicable Federal signage regulations+].
- E. Standards 15 and 17, which are overarching, shall be moved up to the introductory signage paragraph and subsequent standards shall be renumbered.
- F. The following language shall be added to Standard A.17: "...Standards and covenants shall include detailed specifications for sign size, type and materials, fabrication details, mounting and installation."

21. Signage- free-standing:

- A. The details for the free-standing signs shall be enlarged (for ease of reading).
- B. Free-standing signs shall not exceed 26 ft. in height [+along I-25 and 15 ft. along San Mateo Blvd.+]
- C. Minimum type size shall be 4 inches (4").

22. Signage- project identification:

- A. The type of lighting for the project identification signs shall be specified.
- B. The Project Identification Signage section shall have the heading “C” and the different sign size illustrations shall be numbered. [standards need unique identifiers for reference].
- C. The references to Tracts 19, 14 and 20 shall be also identified by location (ex. SW corner of site).

23. Signage- directional:

- A. The following clarification shall be made: “The ~~size~~ [+sign face area+] of traffic directional signs...”.
- B. “Signage area” shall be specified as “sign face area”. [ref: subsection D, directional and informational sign details].
- C. The heading “1. General” shall be added to D. 4 (the renumbered E.4) and the other items renumbered. [can’t have the label “D.a”]
- D. The two instances of “may” shall be changed to “shall” in the transit sign notes.

24. Signage- other, specific types:

- A. No electronic display panels of any kind shall be allowed.
- B. Logo signage shall be discussed as part of the building-mounted signage standards.
- C. The following language shall be reinstated: “Pedestrian oriented signs shall be smaller than vehicle oriented signs. A pedestrian oriented sign is usually read from a distance of 15 to 20 feet.”
- D. Illuminated plastic panel signs shall not be allowed.
- E. The bulleted items under C.4 (the renumbered D.4) shall be assigned a small letter (ex. a, b, etc.)

Sheet A-706:

25. Walls/Fences:

- 
- A. The sentence shall be revised as follows: “~~Except at locations described in these design standards, yard~~ [+perimeter+] walls are not permitted”.
  - B. Exposed, untreated block walls shall be prohibited.
  - C. Chain link fencing shall be prohibited. [standard design standards language]

26. Process:

- A. The Process section shall be reinstated. [standard design standards language]
- B. Variation of building area in excess of areas shown by 10% or more, despite any future delegation to the DRB, shall return to the EPC for reconsideration.
- C. The second site development plan for building permit shall be reviewed by the EPC. Delegation of approval authority to the DRB shall be discussed and decided upon at that time.

27. Minor and Other “clean up”:

- A. All remaining instances of “should” or “may” shall be changed to “shall.”
- B. The description of Tract #18 on Sheet AS-101 shall be “vacant/signage”.
- C. The language on Sheet AS-101 shall not be all capital letters.
- D. Sheet AS-101: A portion of Line 3 under Phasing shall read as follows: “Design standards and ~~restrictions~~ [+requirements+] outlined in this site development plan.”
- E. The location of the bus stop shall be shown on Sheet AS-102.
- F. Acronyms such as NSDP and TBFP shall be spelled out the first time they are used (ex. Section 2E).
- G. Spelling errors shall be corrected including, but not limited to, those on Sheet AS-101 and in Standard 9.A15.
- H. Parking lot ~~lights~~ [+light poles+] shall be...” (Standard 10.B2)
- I. The subjective statement regarding and environment conducive to mass transit shall be removed from Standard 2.H.

---

**28. CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FROM PNM:**

- A. It is the applicant's obligation to determine if existing utility easements cross the property and to abide by any conditions or terms of those easements.
- B. PNM has existing facilities at the project site. Due to the addition of new streets, PNM will require adequate access to the existing PNM substation. Adequate access will be necessary to accommodate large equipment for maintenance or repair. It is required for the applicant to ensure adequate access to PNM's existing facilities by contacting PNM's System Engineering.
- C. Adequate clearance for electric utilities must be provided for safe operation and maintenance purposes. In addition, any relocation, changes or realignment regarding existing electric utilities will be the developer's expense. In some cases, relocation or changes to existing facilities may not be feasible due to physical, use or safety clearance constraints. PNM will review all technical needs, issues and safety clearances for its electric power systems.
- D. The applicant shall coordinate with PNM regarding proposed tree species, the height at maturity and tree placement to avoid interference with the existing electric transmission and/or distribution lines along the project site. PNM's standard is for trees to be planted outside the PNM easement.

**29. CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FROM THE CITY ENGINEER, MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT and NMDOT:**

- A. The Developer is responsible for permanent improvements to the transportation facilities adjacent to the proposed site development plan, as may be required by the Development Review Board (DRB).
- B. A Traffic Impact Study (TIS) has been submitted and reviewed by Transportation Staff.
- C. Per Transportation Development Staff, completion of the required system improvements that are attributable to the development, as identified in the TIS, is required.
- D. The Traffic Impact Study is available for review by any interested party, in the office of the Traffic Engineer.
- E. Without adequate justification, prior approval from the Traffic Engineer and concurrence from the NMDOT, the applicant should call out the proposed internal public street as private. In addition, if both internal streets are intended to function as actual streets, as opposed to simple drive aisles, then the streets will need to be designed to DPM standards (i.e. widths, curb return radii, sidewalks, ADA accessibility, setbacks, parking, access, etc.).
- F. Right turn access from Pan Am Freeway (frontage road) and proposed right-turn deceleration lanes will require NMDOT approval.

- G. Unless the two main east/west private internal streets are being fully constructed (i.e. from San Mateo to Pan Am Freeway), the applicant will need to provide temporary cul-de-sacs at the point of termination of the streets adjacent to Tract 13.
  - H. Provide applicable cross access agreements.
  - I. Concurrent platting action required.
  - J. Site plan shall comply and be designed per DPM Standards.
- 

***FINDINGS -09EPC 40020, September 10, 2009-Site Development Plan for Building Permit***

1. The subject request is for a site development plan for building permit for Signetics Albuquerque Facility, Tract A, Unit B, North Albuquerque Acres, an approximately 60 acre site located between San Mateo Boulevard and Interstate-25, and between San Diego Avenue and Modesto Avenue, zoned SU-2 for M-1.
2. The applicant proposes development of Phase 1, an approximately 60,000 sf office building on the proposed Tract 13.
3. This request accompanies a request for a site development plan for subdivision, with design standards, for the approximately 60 acre subject site (09EPC-40021).
4. Because the subject site is greater than 5 acres in size, it is a Shopping Center (SC) site by definition and is subject to the regulations of Zoning Code §14-16-3-2.
5. The Comprehensive Plan, the North Valley Area Plan, the Facility Plan for Arroyos, the Trails and Bikeways Facility Plan and the North I-25 Sector Development Plan are incorporated herein by reference and are made part of the record for all purposes.
6. The Economic Development Goal and Policy II.C.6a are furthered. Overall, the request would facilitate development of various office, institutional and commercial uses that is diversified and balanced with some environmental goals (Goal). The request would create new jobs which generally



---

have a wide range of skills and salary levels in an area where more job opportunities are needed (Policy 6a).

7. The Transportation and Transit Goal and Transit Policy 4g are partially furthered. The placement of employment and services is generally inefficient in this location with limited transit service. Pedestrian connections are proposed, though large expanses of parking complicate non-vehicle circulation (Goal). Though addressed, non-vehicle modes were not integrated as part of the design concept but were added after the site layout was defined (Policy 4g).

8. The request furthers the following Comprehensive Plan policies:

- A. Policy II.B.5a-full range of urban land uses. Office, retail and hotel uses would generally introduce more land use variety to the area.
- B. Policy II.B.5j-location of new commercial development. The subject site, already zoned for the proposed uses, is in reasonable walking and bicycling distance from the neighborhood and can be considered a larger, area-wide shopping center site by definition.
- C. Policy II.B.5l-quality design/new development. The design of the proposed development would be appropriate for the Plan area and would generally provide for quality and innovation.
- D. Policy II.B.5p-cost effective rehabilitation techniques. The proposal would result in privately funded redevelopment, which can be considered a cost-effective redevelopment technique since it does not use public funds (technique #1).

9. The request partially furthers the following Comprehensive Plan policies:

- A. Policy II.B.5d-neighborhood values/environmental conditions/resources. Neighbors believe that the intensity of the proposed uses will exacerbate traffic problems and may affect scenic resources. The proposed design would not contrast sharply with the mostly industrial setting and recreational opportunities would be provided.
- B. Policy II.B.5i-employment/service use location. The location would generally complement the existing residential area and would be separated from it by roadways. The proposed buildings are mostly located in the center of the subject site, which would generally minimize effects of noise and lighting. However, traffic impacts may adversely affect the existing residential area.
- C. Policy II.B.5m-site design/unique vistas. Re-using a site generally improves the quality of the visual environment, which is the case here. However, the proposed layout would not necessarily maintain and enhance the unique views of the Sandia Mountains.

10. Regarding the North Valley Area Plan (NVAP), the request furthers the following applicable Goals:

- A. General Goal 6. The subject site is located in an established commercial/industrial area and is zoned to allow the proposed uses. The proposed design standards would generally encourage quality re-development.
- B. General Goal 11. The subject site is located in the I-25 corridor, which is an appropriate location for commercial and industrial development.

11. The request partially furthers the following applicable NVAP policies:

- A. Transportation Policy 2. The request would provide pedestrian/bicycle circulation opportunities, but the site layout emphasizes parking and vehicular circulation. Transit service is limited in this part of the Plan area.
- B. Community Design Policy 3b: The request is generally consistent with the uses envisioned in the Plan for the North I-25 subarea, though more consideration could be given to potential neighborhood impacts such as traffic.

12. Regarding the Facility Plan for Arroyos (FPA), the request complies with the following relevant design guidelines for Major Open Space Link Arroyos:

- A. Policy 1a- Building Orientation. Buildings are required to have windows on the northern sides that look toward the La Cueva Arroyo.
- B. Policy 3-Parking & Service Areas. Pedestrian and bicycle access are provided across the parking lots, to the trail along the arroyo. Landscaping along the arroyo would consist of shrubs and trees and function as a screening element.
- C. Landscaping Policy 1. Landscaping adjacent to the arroyo would consist of shrubs and drought-resistant shade trees.

13. A Traffic Impact Study (TIS) and an Air Quality Impact Assessment (AQIA) were required. Both have been completed. Concerning the TIS, coordination with the State Department of Transportation continues regarding the location of access points on Interstate 25.

14. The proposed design standards warrant revisions to provide clarity and specificity to benefit future reviewers, which can be achieved with the incorporation of the Conditions of Approval. Delegation of

approval authority to the DRB is not warranted at this time, but will be reconsidered when the next site development plan for building permit comes before the EPC.

15. The Noreste Neighborhood Association (NRENA), the Wildflower Area NA (WFANA), the District 4 Coalition of Neighborhood Associations and the North Valley Coalition (NVC) were notified. A facilitated meeting was held on June 2, 2009. Neighbors expressed concern, mostly about traffic issues and the TIS. Staff has received one comment letter from a neighbor. An adjacent property owner submitted a letter of general support.

***RECOMMENDATION - 09EPC 40020, September 10, 2009***

**APPROVAL of 09EPC 40020, a Site Development Plan for Building Permit for Signetics Albuquerque Facility, Tract A, Unit B, North Albuquerque Acres, an approximately 60 acre site zoned SU-2 for M-1, located between San Mateo Boulevard and Interstate-25, and between San Diego Avenue and Modesto Avenue, based on the preceding Findings and subject to the following Conditions of Approval.**

***CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -09EPC 40020, September 10, 2009- Site Development Plan for Building Permit***

1. The Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) delegates final sign-off authority of this site development plan to the Development Review Board (DRB). The DRB is responsible for ensuring that all Conditions have been satisfied and that other applicable City requirements have been met. A letter shall accompany the submittal, specifying all modifications that have been made to the site development plan since the EPC hearing, including how the plan has been modified to meet each of the Conditions. Unauthorized changes to this site plan, including before or after DRB final sign-off, may result in forfeiture of approvals.
2. Prior to application submittal to the DRB, the applicant shall meet with the Staff planner to ensure that all conditions of approval are met.
3. The site development plan for building permit shall comply with the design standards for the North I-25 corporate center (09EPC-40021).

4. Pedestrian Walkways:

The sidewalk on the subject site's northern side shall be scaled to measure 6 ft. as required (Standard 2.B.1).

5. Parking /Sustainability:

- A. Parking and drive areas shall have openings at curbs to adjacent landscape for the absorption of water run-off through bio-swales (Standard 5.C2)
- B. All sites shall have water harvesting features (Standard 7M).

6. Bicycles:

- A. Indoor bicycle storage shall be provided at the rate of 1 space per every 15,000 sf of GLSF. [this rate results in the 4 spaces proposed].
- B. Showers and changing rooms shall be provided for 0.5% of building occupants (Standard 2.F). Calculations shall be shown on the site development plan.
- C. Bicycle spaces (not racks) are required at the rate of 1/20 required parking spaces.
- D. The "total bicycle storage provided" shall be removed. [bicycle parking and bicycle storage are not the same thing].

7. Landscaping:

- A. The tree planters in the parking lot islands shall be increased by 8 ft. on each side.
- B. The size label for the parking lot tree planters shall be accurate.
- C. A note shall be added to state that the landscaping plan shall comply with all design standards that pertain to landscaping.

8. Architecture- articulation:

- A. To break up building mass and conform to the design standards, one or a combination of the following shall be added to the building's eastern and western elevations:
  - i. wall plane projections/recesses at least every 100 ft.
  - ii. vertical change in color, texture or material every 50 ft.

- iii. an offset, reveal, pilaster or projecting element at least every 50 ft.
- iv. cornice or base treatments,
- v. art coordinated through the City's art program,
- vi. a change in parapet height for every 100 ft. in length, or
- vii. any other treatment that meets the intent of this section.

[ref: Zoning Code §14-16-3-18 (D)(2), Design Standards for All Non-Residential Uses].

- B. A note shall be added to state that "Large, block like structures having long, unarticulated exterior walls are prohibited" (Standard 8.C2).

9. Architecture- other:

- A. The material and color of the roof shall be specified and shall comply with Standards 7.H and 8.B2.
- B. Metal panels shall be non-reflective (Standard 8.B3).
- C. A single, common name color shall be specified for each of the three colors proposed.

10. Signage:

- A. An informational sign shall be provided near the middle of the subject site near San Mateo Blvd. (ref: Standard 9.A16, and the signage location map).
- B. The monument sign shall be placed near the roadway (San Mateo Blvd.) and the directional signs shall be placed in close proximity to the business(es).
- C. A sign detail shall be provided for each of the following:
  - i. Informational sign
  - ii. Transit sign
  - iii. Building-mounted sign.
- D. Sign area shall be specified as "sign face area" (see sign details).

11. Lighting:

Walkway lighting (DS Sheet A-707) shall replace bollard lighting near the intersection in the approx. middle of the site development plan. (safety)

12. Minor and Other “clean up”:

- A. “Walkway Lighting” and “Informational Sign” shall be added to the keyed notes.
- B. The monument sign detail label shall be revised as follows: “~~Building~~ Monument Sign”.

13. CONDITION OF APPROVAL FROM THE ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH DEPARTMENT:

There is the potential for above-named project to be impacted by the presence of landfill gas generated by a former City owned/operated landfill (Coronado Landfill). The developers of this site are required to follow the most current version of the *City of Albuquerque Interim Guidelines for Development within City Designated Landfill Buffer Zones*. A landfill gas assessment must be completed for this development. A review and approval of the Site Plan(s), the proposed construction, design drawings, and a certification of construction will be required by the Environmental Health Department (EHD), Environmental Services Division.

14. CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FROM THE TRANSIT DEPARTMENT:

The applicant shall provide Right-of -Way (approximately 13 feet wide by 20 feet long) for a future Type C bus shelter as per the COA Std. 2355.

15. CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FROM PNM:

- A. It is the applicant’s obligation to determine if existing utility easements cross the property and to abide by any conditions or terms of those easements.
- B. PNM has existing facilities at the project site. Due to the addition of new streets, PNM will require adequate access to the existing PNM substation. Adequate access will be necessary to accommodate large equipment for maintenance or repair. It is required for the applicant to ensure adequate access to PNM’s existing facilities by contacting PNM’s System Engineering.
- C. Adequate clearance for electric utilities must be provided for safe operation and maintenance purposes. In addition, any relocation, changes or realignment regarding existing electric utilities will be the developer’s expense. In some cases, relocation or changes to existing facilities may not be feasible due to physical, use or safety clearance constraints. PNM will review all technical needs, issues and safety clearances for its electric power systems.
- D. The applicant shall coordinate with PNM regarding proposed tree species, the height at maturity and tree placement to avoid interference with the existing electric transmission and/or distribution lines along the project site. PNM’s standard is for trees to be planted outside the PNM easement.

16. CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FROM THE CITY ENGINEER, MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT and NMDOT:

- A. The Developer is responsible for permanent improvements to the transportation facilities adjacent to the proposed site development plan, as may be required by the Development Review Board (DRB).
  - B. A Traffic Impact Study (TIS) has been submitted and reviewed by Transportation Staff.
  - C. Per Transportation Development Staff, completion of the required system improvements that are attributable to the development, as identified in the TIS, is required.
  - D. The Traffic Impact Study is available for review by any interested party, in the office of the Traffic Engineer.
  - E. Without adequate justification, prior approval from the Traffic Engineer and concurrence from the NMDOT, the applicant should call out the proposed internal public street as private. In addition, if both internal streets are intended to function as actual streets, as opposed to simple drive aisles, then the streets will need to be designed to DPM standards (i.e. widths, curb return radii, sidewalks, ADA accessibility, setbacks, parking, access, etc.).
  - F. Right turn access from Pan Am Freeway (frontage road) and proposed right-turn deceleration lanes will require NMDOT approval.
  - G. Unless the two main east/west private internal streets are being fully constructed (i.e. from San Mateo to Pan Am Freeway), the applicant will need to provide temporary cul-de-sacs at the point of termination of the streets adjacent to Tract 13.
  - H. Provide applicable cross access agreements.
  - I. Concurrent platting action required.
  - J. Site plan shall comply and be designed per DPM Standards.
- 

***Catalina Lehner, AICP***  
***Senior Planner***

cc: North I-25 Corporate Center LLC, Attn. Drew Dolan, 6300 Riverside Plaza Ln NW, Albuquerque, NM 87120  
FBT Architects, Attn: Jared Larsen, 6100 Indian School, Rd. NE, Ste. 210, Albuquerque, NM 87110  
Jeff Peterson, Nor Este N.A., 7800 Eagle Rock Ave., NE, Albuquerque, NM 87122  
Joe Yardumian, Nor Este N.A., 7801 R.C. Gorman Ave. NE, Albuquerque, NM 87122  
Larry T. Caudill, Wildflower Area N.A., 4915 Watercress NE, Albuquerque, NM 87113  
Rick Treadwell, Wildflower Area N.A., 5004 Watercress NE, Albuquerque, NM 87113  
Amy Whitling, District 4 Coalition of N.A.s, P.O. Box 91343, Albuquerque, NM 87199  
Bambi Folk, District 4 Coalition of N.A.s, 6617 Esther NE, Albuquerque, NM 87109  
Chris Catechis, North Valley Coalition, 5733 Guadalupe Tr. NW, Albuquerque, NM 87107  
Claude Morelli, North Valley Coalition, 7 Garden Park Cir. NW, Albuquerque, NM 87107